

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Boc 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/824,998	04/02/2001	Richard Gilles	ESSR:039US	1742
7590 10/01/2004		EXAMINER		
Mark B. Wilson			ZALUKAEVA, TATYANA	
Fulbright & Jav	worski L.L.P.			
Suite 2400		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
600 Congress Avenue			1713	
Austin, TX 78	8701			

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/824,998	GILLES ET AL.					
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Tatyana Zalukaeva	1713					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 20 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated) atimely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to h places the applicatio	o a on in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]						
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.					
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	R 1.136(a) and the appropri ount of the fee. The appropri originally set in the final Off	iate extension riate extension fice action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 20 August 2004. Ap 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			in				
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:						
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simp	lifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed an	nendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ requesting the application in condition for allowance becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause: See Continuation Sheet.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			d an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12, 14-27</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	<u> </u>					
10. Other:							
	TATYANA ZALUKAEVA PRIMARY EXAMINER	Tatyana Zalukaeva					
	Shower &	Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1713					

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No. 009/824,998

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment introduces one or more monomers (vs. one monomer previously considered) of the general formula that encompasses broader range of the of the second monomer species, and thus requires new consideration and/or new search.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' argument resides in contention that the Examiner has not established prima facie case of obviousness of butyleneoxy radical of the reference versus porpyleneoxy radical of the instant claims. This is not found persuasive because such obviousness has been established, since the propoxy and butoxy ate closest structural homologs, and since they are structurally substantially similar their functional behavior is reasonable expected to be similar. Such finding was supported by Court decisions of identical situations, wherein the rejection over structural homolog was held prima facie obvious absent showing unexpected results. Therefore, the Examiner met her burden in establishing prima facie case of obviousness, and it was Applicants burden to show the functional difference between butyleneoxy of the prior art vs. propyleneoxy of the instant claims.